

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 12/11/19 11:28 AM
Received: December 10, 2019
Status: Draft
Tracking No. 1k3-9dsk-ghyc
Comments Due: December 11, 2019
Submission Type: Web

Docket: EPA-R08-OW-2019-0512

Request for Public Comments Regarding the Revised Dewey-Burdock Uranium In-Situ Recovery Underground Injection Control Permits in Edgemont, South Dakota

Comment On: EPA-R08-OW-2019-0512-0132

EPA-R08-OW-2019-0512-0017

Document: EPA-R08-OW-2019-0512-DRAFT-0227

Comment on EPA-R08-OW-2019-0512-0132

Submitter Information

General Comment

I am opposed to the in situ mining of uranium and the deep disposal of the waste water in the Dewey-Burdock area in the Black Hills in southwestern South Dakota. First of all, uranium prices are so low that uranium companies in Wyoming are cutting back personnel, shutting offices, and cutting production. The industry is in such bad shape that every year they come to the Wyoming Legislature and ask for a severance tax cut, even though they aren't paying any taxes due to low production anyway. There is little to be gained from inviting this dying industry into our state.

Second, this area is quite dry, and the fresh water needed to carry out an in situ mining process is sizable. Using this amount of water will place domestic and livestock wells at risk. One need only look to what happened to aquifers in Wyoming during the coal bed methane boom to understand that once an aquifer's level has dropped, wells dry up. This is entirely too risky. As someone with a domestic well, I don't want my freshwater being used for in situ uranium mining and then wasted.

Next, I am opposed to disposing of the waste water through deep injection wells. There is a risk of contaminating drinking water aquifers, and once those are contaminated they can never be reclaimed. Furthermore, there are still hundreds of unplugged bore holes in this area, and until those are plugged and reclaimed, absolutely no in situ mining or deep well injection should be carried out. Wastewater could migrate to those bore holes and contaminate the surrounding land and water. Regardless of where this project goes, plugging those bore holes should be a priority. If we can't expect decades-old holes to be plugged (they are essentially orphaned), then why should we believe that this operation would ever be adequately reclaimed?

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Custer SD